

MAINE EMS EDUCATION /OPERATIONS - JOINT MEETING - MINUTES

Page 1

Date: Wednesday, September 8, 1999, Maine EMS Office, Augusta, Maine

Members Present: P. Marcolini, J. Caron, J. LeBrun, L. Delano, S. Shapleigh, D. Bahr, G. Miller, B. Zito, K. Pomelow, P. Plumer, B. Dunwoody, B. Davis, B. Demchek, D. Carroll, L. Worden, R. Bumps, P. Conley, J. Brinkman

Maine EMS Staff: J. Bradshaw, D. Corning, B. Montejo, D. White

Absent: Dr. Chagrasulis, C. Boehm, D. Palladino, D. Robishaw, P Thibeault

Timekeeper: P. Plumer

TOPIC	DISCUSSION/ACTIONS TAKEN	FUTURE ACTION
-------	--------------------------	---------------

I. Additions to Agenda	There were no additions to the agenda.	
------------------------	--	--

II. Education/Operations: Communications, Expectations, & Decisions	Dwight opened this section of the meeting by advising that Drexell will be facilitating joint meeting. Drexell began by reviewing his role as the facilitator, the purpose, desired outcomes, and ground rules of this meeting. He presented the following as the purpose of the meeting:	
---	---	--

1. To identify the roles and responsibilities of the Education Committee and the Operations Team as entities of the Board.
2. To identify the individual roles and responsibilities for members of the Education Committee and Operations Team.
3. To identify and chart how tasks are assigned; how work is conducted; and, how information is shared amongst the Operations Team, the Education Committee and the Maine EMS Board.

The desired outcomes were stated as:

1. To create a list of individual and group roles and responsibilities for the Education Committee and Operations Team which may be submitted to the Maine EMS Board for its approval.
2. To create a flowchart outlining the steps involved in the assignment and management of tasks/projects and in the sharing of information amongst the Operations Team, the Education Committee and the Maine EMS Board.

Following this review, the facilitator opened the floor to the chairs of the respective committees for any opening comments. J. Bradshaw reviewed the events that led to the

meeting, in particular, the concern regarding the lines of communication between these groups, how information is shared between these groups, and what the expectations were of the groups. (He highlighted the issues around the recent CEH proposal, and its process as an illustration of this, and he expressed aspiration that the purpose and process of the meeting will lead to a method of operation that is mutually understanding and respectful regarding the goals of each committee and how we can all work together). P. Marcolin agreed with Jay's Comments and echoed his desire to reach a more beneficial working relationship.

The group entered into a brainstorming/discussion session to identify the roles and responsibilities of the Education Committee and the Operations Team as entities of the Maine EMS Board. The results of this session have been compiled into two lists titled EDUCATION and OPERATIONS TEAM and are attached to the minutes.

Following this session, the group spent some time reviewing where to go from here. P. Plumer noted that the respective groups do already do everything that is outlined on the lists, and he suggested that the groups at how they can improve what they are already doing rather than start from scratch and assume that each group is not doing these things.

Drexell suggested that the group spend some time reviewing the list to come to consensus on the specific responsibilities of each committee so that everyone has a clear understanding of what each group does. This led into a discussion of the following particular items on this list:

Education Item #7 (Ensure competency of IC) It was suggested that the Education Committee ensures adequacy of training to be an IC, but that the competency of an instructor who is teaching is a training entity or regional issue. The question was posed by Drexell as to should the Education Committee be responsible for ensuring IC Competency? This led to further discussion with the suggestion that the Education Committee's role is really to set the standard to become an instructor and not to act as an enforcement committee towards instructors, Drexell suggested that this may be a topic for the waiting room and future discussion.

Education Item #5 (Temper education to needs of regions) It was suggested that the Education Committee should not alter education for each region but should establish educational standard.

Education Item #1 (Development of new curriculum...) It was suggested that we real don't develop new curriculum in Maine. We seem to take other nationally recognize curriculum and modify them to Maine's need. It was suggested that this be word smithed to include development and/or evaluation/modification and recommendation curriculum.

Education Item #6 (Determine the standards for educational credentialling) This was explained as determining what type of education (hours and content) would be needed prior to renewal of a license. The next steps in the process consists of

The group entered into a brief discussion regarding who can set a standard for the EMS system. The question of can the Education Committee set a standard or do they recommend a standard to the Board was discussed. Jay advised that both committees make recommendations to the Board and that it is only the Board who can establish what the standard in the EMS system will be.

Next steps- the consensus of the group was that a "boil down" (consolidation of similar points) of these lists will be conducted and reviewed by the respective committees at their next meetings. There was discussion regarding the need to conduct a presentation to the Board. It was suggested that after this is fine tuned, a mini presentation to the Board that includes insight as to how we got to this point, why we went through this exercise and the result of the exercise. Drexell asked if anyone had any difficulty with any of the items listed and expressed a desire to develop a list of roles and responsibilities for each committee that would go to the Board for their approval

Following this session there was a brief discussion regarding the roles and responsibilities of these committees from the Board's perspective. D. Carroll inquired if there is any document that exists from the Board which describes its expectations of the various committees, and if not, he suggested we inquire this from the Board.

1. Boil Down of lists will be conducted by Jay and Dwight. Two documents will be developed, the first is a verbatim of the list developed in this exercise and the second will be a "boil down" (an affinity grouping) of these lists which will be conducted by staff with assistance from representatives of both committees (J. LeBrun and P. Plumer volunteered as point people for their respective committees). This is to be completed and ready for review at each committee's next meeting.

2. A formal presentation to the Board by a representative of each group at the January Board meeting. Jay and Dwight will be responsible for assuring that each respective committee follows through on this.

III. Overview of Curriculum Review Subcommittee Minutes from September

Copies of the minutes from the Maine EMS Curriculum Review Subcommittee were distributed and D. Corning and L. Delano provided an overview of the discussions that have taken place in this Subcommittee. D. Corning advised all present that the review ongoing and that this brief review of the most obvious areas of impact regarding the new National Standard Curricula is being brought forward to keep everyone apprised of issues that may pose concern early in the process and to try to get some early feedback from various interested parties regarding these areas of impact. There was discussion regarding the need for a true side by side comparison of the current curriculum and the proposed national standard curriculum that included CBO, didactic hours, lab hours, clinical and internship, etc. D. Corning advised that there is still considerable work for the Subcommittee to complete, and that this was brought forward only as a preliminary informational piece to keep key players apprised of what is going on. The Subcommittee expressed a desire to have some initial feedback from the key players regarding their comfort level in continuing this process. For example, knowing that there will be an increase in the required number of patient assessments (from 10 to 110 per student), do people feel that this is workable in Maine or would this kind of increase create hardship (both financial and resource) that the regions would express great concern about their ability to accomplish in a course in Maine (from an operations stand point). Thus, if the regions expressed great concern (or disapproval) about these increases, how much effort and resources should be committed to the review? It was noted that it is very difficult to give a definitive “yeah” or “neah” on a project such as this without having all of the information that a thorough comparison document would provide.

P. Marcolini mentioned that this situation points to the need to pull this process together and to establish a clear benchmark regarding what information gets passed along to the various committees and when it gets passed. A brief discussion continued regarding the process of soliciting feedback from other committees, and ensuring the transfer of information early on in various projects to ensure that long hours are not wasted. It was suggested that close attention be paid to how questions from one committee to another be phrased so as to ensure that the information received is what is truly being sought.

D. Corning again advised the group that the Subcommittee is really looking for general support or lack thereof, not based on definitive information but based on the initial rou

information. He asked for feedback regarding- is the Subcommittee working in the right direction.

**IV. EMT-I:
Implementation of
Enhanced Program**

D. Corning passed around the most recent draft of the EMT-I Curriculum Review & Update. He advised that the second draft of the new curriculum has been completed and will be distributed to L. Delano, D. Palladino, P. Conley, and P. Marcolini for review. There was a brief discussion of how many hours will be added to the current program and how many hours the upgrade will consist of. D. Corning advised that the old (current) minimum was 62 hours and that the new (proposed Enhanced) is recommended to be a minimum of 85 -96 hours of didactic.

**V. Entry Requirements
for First Responder &
EMT-Basic Courses**

D. Corning reviewed the draft Entry Standards for First Responder and EMT-Basic Programs document that was drafted by the Education Committee. He advised that this does not have to be discussed today but is being provided for review and possible future discussion at OPS. D. Bahr expressed concern as to how these standards relate to Maine EMS and Technical College entry requirements. D. Corning advised that this document was worked on after gathering information from each of the regions and is only a recommendation from the Education Committee. There was some discussion as to whether or not this was voted as a recommendation from Education; several members advised that they were under the impression that this issue was being held in the Education Committee until a recommendation was received from the TC Task Force. D. Corning advised that he would research this in the past minutes (*he referred members to the April 1999 Education Committee minutes*).

**II.
Education/Operations:
Communications,
Expectations, &
Decisions CONTINUED.**

Due to time constraints the consensus of the group was to schedule another joint meeting for October 26, 1999, to complete the agenda for the facilitated discussion.

Next meetings:
OPS -October 5, 1999 @ 9:00 AM
Education- October 13, 1999
@9:00AM
Joint- October 26, 1999 @9:00 AM

VI. Adjourned @11:59AM Respectfully Submitted,
B. Montejo



ANGUS S. KING, JR.
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
MAINE EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES
16 EDISON DRIVE
AUGUSTA, MAINE
04330

MICHAEL F. KELLY
COMMISSIONER

JAY BRADSHAW
DIRECTOR

Result of Ops/Ed Brainstorming - 9/8/99

Identify the roles and responsibilities of the Education Committee and the Operations Team as entities of the Maine EMS Board:

OPERATIONS TEAM

1. Recommendations to Board.
2. Catch all (making it all happen).
3. Streamline Authority Process (easier implementation).
4. Find/manage resources for various projects.
5. Provide guidance (along with Board) and expectations.
6. Systems Development/Coordination.
7. Analyze/implement curriculum within regions.
8. Solicit and receive direction from Board.
9. Act as consultants to other committees.
10. Represent service issues.
11. Utilize consistent approval process.
12. Coordinate and access regional and state education opportunities.
13. Facilitate professional credibility.
14. Empower part. to allow Board validation (not examination).
15. Disseminate information to allow providers: who, what, where, when, etc.
16. Understand/solicit Board expectations.
17. Use data and current literature in decision process (to extend possibilities).
18. Develop Rules/Law--re: education.
19. Overall provider resource.
20. Communication with Exam Committee.
21. Seek evaluation and feedback on products (overall).
22. Record/update:
 - Process
 - Decisions
 - Implementation
 - Changes

EDUCATION

1. Development of new curriculum based on solid educational components/standards.
2. Evaluation/modification of existing curriculum.
3. Recommendations to Board.
4. Review/development of IC Program.
5. Temper education to needs of Regions.
6. Determine standards for educational credentialling.
7. Ensure competency of IC's (see 26)
8. Revise/revamp education requirements for licensure.
9. Establish philosophy to elevate standards.
10. Ensure that curricula are appropriate and adequate to achieve desired level of understanding.
11. Develop template for delivery of continuing education.
12. Coordinate and access regular and state educational opportunities.
13. Coordination (inter-regional) of education.
14. Solicit/recommend instruction from Board.
15. Act as consultants to other committees.
16. Facilitate professional credibility.
17. Empower our participation to allow Board validation (not examination).
18. Understand/solicit Board expectations.
19. Use data and current literature in decision process (to extend possibilities).
20. ?Role/responsibility in training entity
 - extent of T.E.
 - influence/style/capability on educational philosophy
21. Distance Learning:
 - continuing education
 - licensure
22. Develop Rules/Law--re: education
23. Communication with Exam Committee.
24. Seek evaluation and feedback on products (focused).
25. Record and maintain record of process and decisions.
26. Advisor---Not regulator.
 - set standards (not enforcement)